



MEMORANDUM

To: Region 2 Members

From: David Klassen, MD
Region 2 Councillor

Subject: October 28, 2011 Regional Meeting

Date: September 13, 2011

You are reminded that the next Region 2 Meeting will be held on Friday, October 28, 2011. This meeting is scheduled from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and will be held at the Gift of Life Donor Program, 401 North 3rd Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19123. A working lunch will be provided.

Most of you will be able to fly, drive, or train to the Philadelphia area the morning of the meeting. However, for those of you who require an overnight accommodation, please contact the Hyatt Regency at Penn's Landing and ask for the Gift of Life rate (a discounted rates for individuals attending conferences at Gift of Life). Although the Hyatt is the preferred hotel, there is also a Sheraton in close proximity to the Gift of Life facility.

Following is the hotel information:

Hyatt Regency at Penn's Landing
200 S. Columbus Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19106
Phone: (215) 928-1234

Sheraton Society Hill Hotel
One Dock Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
215-238-6000

In addition to regional business, we will discuss and vote on fourteen national policy proposals scheduled to be distributed on September 16, 2011. Brief summaries of the proposals are included in the draft meeting agenda below. Beginning September 16, the proposals can be viewed in their entirety on the OPTN website, <http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov>, under the "Policy Management" menu. If there is any region specific business you would like to have added to the agenda, please contact Betsy Gans, our Regional Administrator, at betsy.gans@unos.org, or me at dklassen@medicine.umaryland.edu, with those items. An updated agenda will be distributed prior to meeting.

I encourage you to get involved in UNOS through attending this upcoming regional meeting and participating in the policy making process.

AGENDA BELOW

AGENDA
Region 2 Meeting
Gift of Life Donor Program
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
October 28, 2011

(Note: All times except the start time are approximate. Actual times will be determined by the amount of discussion.)

9:00 Registration and Continental Breakfast

10:00 Welcome/Opening Remarks

David Klassen, MD
Region 2 Councillor

- April regional meeting summary
- June 2011 OPTN/UNOS Board meeting summary
- Committee nominations
- Spring meeting date/location
- Public comment document distribution at regional meetings

10:15 UNOS Update

John Lake, MD
OPTN/UNOS, President

11:00 OPTN/UNOS Committee Reports and Voting on Public Comment Proposals - Below is a summary of the proposals that will be submitted for public comment on September 16, 2011. At that time you will be able access the proposals at <http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov>.

Moderator: David Klassen, MD
Region 2 Councillor

*****A Working Lunch will be provided at 12:30*****

Kidney Transplantation

Shamkant Mulgaonkar, MD

Proposal to Clarify Requirements for Waiting Time Modification Requests

Current OPTN/UNOS policies for submitting waiting time modification requests are not clear, leading to wasted time for the transplant centers that submit requests, for OPTN Contractor staff who process requests, and for the Committees that review requests. Required documentation is often missing and results in delays for transplant candidates to receive the waiting time that they may be entitled to receive under OPTN policy. With these proposed clarifications, the Committee expects to see fewer submissions of incomplete requests and faster time to implementation of approved requests.

Liver and Intestinal Organ Transplantation

Andrew Cameron, MD

Proposal to Extend the “Share 15” Regional Distribution Policy to “Share 15 National”

The Committee is proposing an extension of the current “Share 15 Regional” policy so that deceased donor livers (age 18 and higher) would be offered to all candidates with MELD/PELD scores of 15 or higher locally, regionally, and nationally before being offered to candidates with lower MELD/PELD scores.

Proposal for a New Category of Status 1 Candidates

The Committee is proposing to expand the Status 1 category in order to include additional candidates who have waiting list mortality rates similar to candidates in Status 1A and 1B. This proposal would create a new category of Status 1, ‘Status 1MELD35’ (or Status1M), that would include candidates with MELD/PELD scores of 35 and higher. Following all combined local and regional Status 1A and 1B candidates, deceased donor livers age 18 and higher would be offered to

candidates listed in Status 1M ranked by their MELD/PELD score, with local candidates given priority over regional candidates at each level of MELD/PELD score.

Thoracic Organ Transplantation

Raymond Benza, MD

Plain Language Modifications to the Adult and Pediatric Heart Allocation Policies, Including the Requirement of Transplant Programs to Report in UNet a Change in Criterion or Status within Twenty-Four Hours of that Change

The OPTN Contractor's policy evaluation plan requires that heart transplant programs record in UNetSM changes to a heart transplant candidate's status or criterion within 24 hours, but this requirement is not written in Policies 3.7.3 (Adult Candidate Status) and 3.7.4 (Pediatric Candidate Status). The two policies state that the OPTN Contractor will notify "a responsible member of the transplant team" prior to downgrading a candidate's status, but the OPTN Contractor does not notify such personnel in addition to displaying the candidate's status in UNet. (Clinicians may view a candidate's status at any time in UNet.) The proposed policy includes the 24-hour requirement, removes the notification clause, and includes edits for plain language. For consistency, the modifications also include language about potential referral of pediatric heart status exception case decisions to the Thoracic Organ Transplantation Committee.

Ad Hoc International Relations and Ethics

Robert L Kormos M.D.

Proposed Revisions to and Reorganization of Policy 6.0 (Transplantation of Non-Resident Aliens), Which Include Changes to the Non-Resident Alien Transplant Audit Trigger Policy and Related Definitions

This proposal clarifies the data collected about the citizenship and residency of donors and recipients. The proposal also amends the audit trigger policy, allowing the Ad Hoc International Relations Committee to review the circumstances of any transplant and make a public report. The proposal also contains technical amendments and removal of requirements that are not enforceable.

Histocompatibility

Dimitri Monos, PhD

Proposed Update to the Calculated PRA (CPRA)

The purpose of this proposal is to update CPRA so it can better reflect current lab practices as well the current donor pool. These revisions include updating the HLA frequencies used to calculate CPRA, the addition of the antigen C to the calculation and the removal of zero (0) as a default value.

Revision of the UNOS Bylaws, the OPTN Bylaws and the OPTN Policies that Govern HLA Laboratories

This proposal revises the UNOS Bylaws and Policies that apply to histocompatibility laboratories to more closely align OPTN/UNOS requirements for member laboratories with current laboratory practices.

Living Donor

Diane James, RN, MSN

Proposal to Establish Requirements for the Informed Consent of Living Kidney Donors

This proposal would establish policy requirements for the informed consent of living kidney donors. This proposal is in response to a directive from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) and based on recommendations from a Joint Societies Steering Committee composed of representatives of the American Society of Transplantation (AST); the American Society of Transplant Surgeons (ASTS); and the North American Transplant Coordinators Organization (NATCO) to the OPTN/UNOS Living Donor Committee.

Proposal to Establish Minimum Requirements for Living Kidney Donor Follow-UP

This proposal would require transplant programs to report required fields on the Living Donor Follow-up (LDF) form at required post-operative reporting periods (6, 12, and 24 months). The OPTN currently relies on Living Donor Follow-up (LDF) forms to collect data on the short-term health status of living donors. Data on living donors who donated in 2006

through 2009 demonstrate that many programs do not report meaningful living donor follow-up information at required reporting intervals. Consequently, to allow for meaningful analyses to objectively study the short-term effects of living donation, the transplant community must collectively improve patient information on the LDF form. The proposed minimum reporting requirements are based on recommendations from the Joint Society Work Group, which is composed of representatives from the American Society of Transplantation (AST), the American Society of Transplant Surgeons (ASTS), and the North American Transplant Coordinators Organization (NATCO) to the OPTN/UNOS Living Donor Committee.

Proposal to Establish Requirements for the Medical Evaluation of Living Kidney Donors

This proposal would establish policy requirements for the medical evaluation of living kidney donors. This proposal is in response to a directive from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), and based on recommendations from a Joint Societies Steering Committee composed of representatives of the American Society of Transplantation (AST); the American Society of Transplant Surgeons (ASTS) and the North American Transplant Coordinators Organization (NATCO) to the Living Donor Committee.

Organ Procurement Organization (OPO)

Susan Stuart, RN, MPM

Proposal to Eliminate the Use of an “Alternate” Label when Transporting Organs on Mechanical Preservation Machines and to Require the OPTN Distributed Standardized Label

This proposal would make labeling of these machines consistent for all deceased and living donor organs that are transported outside of donor hospitals. Current policy allows the use of an “alternate” label, or a label other than the OPTN standardized label, when transporting organs on a mechanical preservation machine. OPOs create their own alternate labels resulting in inconsistent labeling. The proposed policy changes eliminate the use of alternate shipping labels on mechanical preservation machines and require OPOs to use a new standardized label that is part of the current color-coded labeling system distributed by the OPTN contractor.

Proposal to Change the Term “Consent” to “Authorization” Throughout Policy When Used in Reference to Organ Donation

The proposed modification will change the term "consent" to "authorization" throughout policy when used in reference to deceased organ donation. Currently, OPTN policy uses the term “consent” to describe the act of making an anatomical gift. However, the public associates “consent” with the medico-legal concept of “informed consent” through which physicians must give patients all the information they need to understand the risks, benefits, and costs of a particular medical treatment.

In the context of organ/tissue/eye donation after death, this blending of terms leads to misunderstandings about the act of donation that could hinder our national goal of increasing organ/tissue/eye donation and transplantation. The OPO community has responded to this circumstance by changing the donation terminology from “consent” to “authorization.” This change focuses attention on the altruistic act of donation and reinforces the fact that donation after death does not involve medical treatment.

Proposal to Modify the Imminent and Eligible (I & E) Neurological Death Data Reporting Definitions

The proposed policy changes clarify the definitions for determining whether a death can be classified as “imminent” or “eligible.” OPOs are responsible for reporting data that classify a death as either an Imminent Neurologic Death (“imminent,”) or Eligible Death (“eligible,”) or neither “eligible” nor “imminent” (“neither.”) The OPOs then report the “imminent” and “eligible” deaths to the OPTN. There are inconsistencies in the data reporting which have been primarily attributed to:

- OPOs interpreting the definitions in Policy 7.1 (Reporting Definitions) differently, and
- Brain death laws varying from state to state affecting the way the deaths are reported.

The Committee eliminated Multi-system organ failure as an exclusionary criteria for classifying a death as “eligible”, and identified a list of organ specific exclusionary criteria that has been added to provide more detailed guidance. The

Committee also made changes to the definition of “imminent” so that it is restricted to those deaths that would most likely be classified as “eligible” had brain death been legally declared. This could allow the combination of “eligible” and “imminent” deaths to mitigate the effect of the variation in brain death laws.

Policy Oversight (POC)

TBD

Proposal to Clarify and Improve Variance Policies

This proposal streamlines and clarifies requirements for review and approval of variances, including gathering all requirements into one policy category for the variance application, review, approval, modification, dissolution, and appeal processes; detailing the process for appealing a variance decision of the Committee or Board of Directors; eliminating redundancy in existing variance policies; and rewriting the variance policies using plain language.

*****The following committees do not have any proposals out for public comment but may have an brief update for the region on committee activity*****

Ethics

Peter Reese, MD

Finance

Mark Rappaport

Pancreas Transplantation

James Lim, MD

Pediatric Transplantation

Stephen Dunn, MD

Minority Affairs

Stacey Brann, MD

Operations and Safety

Alden Doyle, MD, MS, MPH & TM

Transplant Administrators

Joseph Anton, RN, MSN

Membership and Professional Standards

Michael Shapiro, MD

Patient Affairs (no report)

James Gleason

Transplant Coordinators (no report)

Heather Shank-Givens

2:55 Old/ New Business

3:00 Adjournment

Confidentiality Statement:

This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.